

Herrmannsen (1849) had designated *Obliquaria subrotunda* Rafinesque, 1820 (currently *Obovaria subrotunda*) as the type species. They established the new genus *Cyclonaias* for *Obliquaria tuberculata*. It is surprising that Ortmann & Walker (1922) cite Herrmannsen's type designation for *Rotundaria* but not his designation for *Obovaria* (pp. 407, 132 in the same volume). However, in this case, Herrmannsen was not the first to select a type. Valenciennes (1827) reported *Obliquaria tuberculata* specimens from Rafinesque, which he says were identified as the type of a new genus, *Rotundaria*. Thus, *Rotundaria* is a senior objective synonym of *Cyclonaias*. *Cyclonaias tuberculata* occurs phylogenetically within *Quadrula* as currently used (Campbell et al., 2005; the result of Serb et al., 2003, reflects a mixing of tissue clips with *Potamilus alatus*) and so *Rotundaria* is not available for species currently placed in *Obovaria*.

Additional references

- Campbell, D.C., Serb, J.M., Buhay, J.E., Roe, K.J., Minton, R.L. & Lydeard, C. 2005. Phylogeny of North American amblymines (Bivalvia, Unionoida): prodigious polyphyly proves pervasive across genera. *Invertebrate Biology*, **124**(2): 131–164.
- Herrmannsen, A.N. 1849. *Indicis Generum Malacozoorum Primorida*, vol. 2. Pp. xxix–xlii, 1–717. Theodore Fischer, Cassells.
- Ortmann, A.E. 1911. A monograph of the najades of Pennsylvania, parts I and II. *Memoirs of the Carnegie Museum*, **4**(6): 279–347.
- Serb, J.M., Buhay, J.E. & Lydeard, C. 2003. Molecular systematics of the North American freshwater bivalve genus *Quadrula* (Unionidae: Amblyminae) based on mitochondrial ND1 sequences. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **28**(1): 1–11.
- Valenciennes, A. 1827. *Coquilles fluviatiles bivalves de nouveau-continent recueillies pendant le voyage de M.M. de Humboldt et Bonpland. Recueil d'Observations de Zoologie et d'Anatomie Comparée . . . par Al. de Humboldt & A. Bonpland*, vol. 2. Pp. 225–237. Smith & Gide, Paris.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout de Barneville, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera)
(Case 3337; see BZN **64**: 87–89)

(1) R. Angus

President of the Balfour-Browne Club (water beetle society), Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey, TW20 0EX, U.K.
(e-mail: r.angus@rhul.ac.uk)

The proposed application to have *Hydroporus neuter* placed on the Official Index of Rejected Names in Zoology has my fullest support. It is wrong that the application to conserve *H. discretus* was rejected, and appears quite outside the norm in recent cases. I gather that the application was rejected because it attracted insufficient favourable comment. My own view is that it appeared such an overwhelmingly compelling case that comment was superfluous. I very much hope that this second attempt succeeds. It would be wrong to lose such a well-known and well-established name as *Hydroporus discretus*, which must be conserved.

(2) E.J. van Nieuwerkerken

National Museum of Natural History, Darwinweg 2, 2333 CR Leiden,
The Netherlands (e-mail: nieuwerkerken@naturalis.nl)

I have now studied the case in detail; it had only briefly passed me before. I think that the authors have had very bad luck, the case is almost enough for the new nomen oblitum (Article 23.9.2 of the Code), apart from this list by Ádám. I think that the case was not presented strongly enough and that not enough people have sent positive comments. I strongly agree that the ruling should be reversed and that *Hydroporus discretus* must be conserved as a valid name for a species we have always known as *discretus* – I had never really considered the name *neuter* before.

(3) G. Foster

Scottish Agricultural College, Research and Development Division, Auchincruive,
Ayr, KA6 5HW, U.K.

I agree with the need to conserve the name *Hydroporus discretus* by the Commission revising their views and setting aside the name *Hydroporus neuter*. Otherwise the Commission will bring itself into disrepute for failing in its primary duty to stabilise nomenclature.

(4) C.H.S. Watts

South Australian Museum, Science Centre, North Terrace, Adelaide, 5000 South
Australia, Australia (e-mail: Watts.Chris@saugov.sa.gov.au)

I totally agree that the name *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout de Barneville should be conserved to avoid 'sinking' a century of work accessed through that name.

(5) F. Marnell

National Parks and Wildlife Service, 7 Ely Place, Dublin 2, Ireland

The proposed change of name appears to contradict all zoological and nomenclatural sense and I wholeheartedly support your endeavours to have the name *Hydroporus discretus* conserved.

(6) H.V. Shaverdo

Naturhistorisches Museum, Burgring 7, A-1010 Wien, Austria
(e-mail: shaverdo@mail.ru)

Systematics of the genus *Hydroporus* has been the main focus of my research for more than ten years. In numerous papers on taxonomy, faunistics, ecology, phenology and larval morphology *Hydroporus discretus* was always treated by me under this name. A very important reason to conserve the name *H. discretus* is that recently it has been published as a valid name in two very important catalogues (Nilsson, 2001, 2003). If *H. neuter* is used as a valid name, it would cause considerable nomenclatural confusion.